

ALLOWANCE

1. This action is in response to the Remarks and Preliminary Amendment filed on April 17, 2006, in which Applicant canceled claims 1-11 and added claims 12-21. Claims 12-17 and 20-21 are allowed.

Priority

2. This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/11667, filed on October 14, 2004 and which claims the benefit of foreign priority to ITALY MI203A002020, filed on October 17, 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references in the IDS dated April 17, 2006, are made of record.

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 12-17 and 20-21, drawn to piperazinyl compounds, composition, and process of making said compounds, compounds classified in class 544, subclasses 366 and 367.
- II. Claims 18-19, drawn to various methods of treatment, classified in class 514, subclasses 254.03 and 254.07.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the

product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, other materially different products can be used for the same process. For instance, antibiotics can also be used to treat bacterial infections.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be

considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

During a telephone conversation with Len Mitchard on March 20, 2008, a provisional election was made to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 12-17 and 20-21.

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

5. The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where Applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of

the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the Examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Examiner's Amendment

6. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to Applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

In a telephone discussion dated March 20, 2008, Applicant gave Examiner authorization for this Examiner's Amendment.

The Application has been amended as follows:

Claims 18 and 19: CANCELLED.

Applicant reserves the right to recapture the cancelled subject matter in one or more subsequent divisional applications.

Reasons for Allowance

7. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the elected invention is free of the prior art and the form of the application is acceptable. The closest prior art is Kampe, et al., EP 0 237 963 A2. The difference between the instant compounds and the compounds of the reference is that the instant claims require aryl at position B, whereas the compounds of the reference require the corresponding position Y to be heterocyclic.

Any comments considered necessary by Applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Erich A. Leeser whose telephone number is 571-272-9932. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 6:00 EST.

Art Unit: 1624

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached at 571-272-0661. The fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free at 866-217-9197. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Erich A. Leeser/

Erich A. Leeser

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624

United States Patent and Trademark Office

400 Dulany Street, Remsen 5C11

Alexandria, VA 22314-5774

Tel. No.: (571) 272-9932

/James O. Wilson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624

James O. Wilson

Supervisory Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624

United States Patent and Trademark Office

400 Dulany Street, Remsen 5A11

Alexandria, VA 22314-5774

Tel. No.: (571) 272-0661